DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 546 SP 022 402

AUTHOR Foster, Clifford D.; Calder, James
TITLE A Literature Search as a Data Source for the Development of a Student Teacher Evaluation System and the Identification of One Hundred Ninety-Nine Evaluation Criteria, 1981-82. Research Report No. 83-2.
INSTITUTION Washington Univ., Seattle. Teacher Education Research Center.
PUB DATE 2 May 83
NOTE 81p.; Appendix A may not reproduce well due to small print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Research; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Search Strategies; Student Evaluation; *Student Teachers; Systems Development; Teacher Behavior; Teacher Education; Teacher Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

A research project was designed to produce a new system for evaluating student teachers at the University of Washington. A literature search provided the basis for a conceptual framework for the development of an evaluation instrument. Conclusions derived from the literature were: (1) Rationales for teacher evaluation include subjective-humanistic, behavioral, and eclectic ideologies; (2) The process, product, and naturalistic approaches to evaluation were the most visible in the literature sampled; (3) Literature reviews, expert opinion, and ethnographic study were used to validate evaluation criteria; and (4) The design of an evaluation instrument should be determined with assurance of agreement among the rationale, approach, and criteria. A description is given of the phases of the study and the method of determining an evaluation system based on an analysis of documents found in the literature search. A list of 199 evaluation criteria generated by the study is appended, as well as the performance based evaluation instrument and lists of the resources and references used in the study. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED230546

A Literature Search as a Data Source for the Development of A Student Teacher Evaluation System and the Identification of One Hundred Ninety-Nine Evaluation Criteria

1981-82

TEACHER EDUCATION RESEARCH CENTER

Research Report No. 83-2

University of Washington
College of Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Roger G. Olstad

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

May 2, 1983

Clifford D. Foster
James Calder

SP022 402

A Literature Search as a Data Source for the Development of
A Student Teacher Evaluation System and the Identification of
One Hundred Ninety-Nine Evaluation Criteria

ABSTRACT

This research project was designed to produce a new system for the evaluation of student teachers at the University of Washington. The need for a new system stemmed from recent developments in teacher education. These developments included changes in certification standards, availability of computer technology, and a growing emphasis on research. The need to relate the evaluation of student teachers with program outcomes necessitated a modification in the present system. Also needed were evaluation criteria that would provide sufficient variance for the determination of more effective and less effective student teachers.

To accomplish these ends, a literature search was conducted followed by a documentary analysis. These activities provided data for the development of a conceptual framework for decision making. The study also yielded a total of 199 evaluation criteria that had been generated through validation studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

--A Shift from a Focus on Teacher Preparation to a Growing Emphasis on Research 1

--The Development of Computerized Data Management Systems. 3

--The Adoption of New Standards for Teacher Certification 4

PURPOSE OF STUDY. 7

PROCEDURE 8

--Phase One: Initial Search Activity 8

--Phase Two: A Follow-up ERIC Search 9

--Phase Three: Personal Contacts with National Leaders in the Evaluation of Teaching 9

--Phase Four: Sorting Procedure for Review of the Eighty-One Publications Produced by the Literature Search 10

--Phase Five: Report of the Literature Search: A Conceptual Framework for Decision Making in the Development of a Student Teacher Evaluation System at the University of Washington. 14

Rationales for Teacher Evaluation 14

Approaches to Evaluation 15

Selection of Criteria 17

Design of Evaluation Instruments 18

Summary of Literature Search 19

STUDY OUTCOMES. 20

--Phase Six: The Determination of a System for the Evaluation of Student Teachers at the University of Washington 20

--Phase Seven: The Selection of Criteria (Skills and Performance Indicators) for Student Teacher Evaluation 21

APPENDIXES

Appendix A Performance Based Evaluation Instrument 22

Appendix B Sources Obtained as a Result of Telephone Conversations with National Leaders 24

Appendix C List of References Used in the Development of a Conceptual Framework for Evaluation of Student Teachers. 27

Appendix D Sources for 199 Skills and Performance Indicators. 32

Appendix E Master List of Teacher Evaluation Indicators. 34

TABLES

Table 1 Sources for the Initial Search of Professional Literature, 1975-82, on Student Teaching Evaluation Instruments. 9

Table 2 Descriptions for Search on Professional Literature Published 1975-82, on Student Teacher Evaluation Instruments 9

Table 3 A Coding System for Classification of Eighty-One Publications on Student Teacher Evaluation 13

INTRODUCTION

This report provides a description of a research project designed to produce a new system for the evaluation of student teachers at the University of Washington. While the evaluation instrument currently used has provided useful information about how student teachers perform, it no longer has the capability of responding to recent developments in the field.[1] These developments have produced drastic changes in the expectations held for the evaluation of student teachers. Three of these developments are discussed in the following sections.

A Shift from a Focus on Teacher Preparation to a Growing Emphasis on Research

Educators often are confronted by questions about teacher effectiveness. The frequency of these questions has increased markedly with the growing public concern about accountability in all sectors of the economy that rely on public funding for their support. An inflationary spiraling of costs in education, together with an economic recession, has created a growing demand for better teachers in the public schools. As Medley has stated, there are two important ways to improve teacher effectiveness:

> One is by improving the ways teachers are evaluated, and the other is by changing the ways teachers are educated. Either type of change can result in improvement only if it is based on accurate information about differences in the behavior patterns of more

---

[1] See Appendix A for a copy of this instrument.

effective and less effective teachers, and the only reliable source of such information is sound research.[2]

Medley makes a strong case for the need for research in providing the profession with accurate information about teacher effectiveness. Research in this context is not new, however. Professional educators have attempted, over many decades, to research the characteristics of teacher effectiveness. Olstad et al. comment on the status of current efforts to research effective student teaching:

> While research in teacher education is important in many colleges of education, the instruments available, which reflect a concern for evaluation, tend to be based on a model of mastery. In such a model, student teachers are observed and guided with the attainment of mastery as the final goal.[3]

The mastery model referred to in the foregoing statement provides a poor data source for research, as mastery is either attained by the student teacher or s/he leaves the program by request or as a result of the student's decision. As a result the mastery model permits little remaining variance among those student teachers who complete the program because all

---

[2]Donald M. Medley, "The Effectiveness of Teachers," in Research on Teaching: Concepts, Findings, and Implications, ed. Penelope L. Peterson and Herberg J. Walberg. (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1979, p. 71).

[3]Roger G. Olstad, Jack L. Beal, Christine C. Schaefer, and Katherine L. Schlick Noe, "Preservice Teaching Performance: A Study of Predictor Variables (A Preliminary Report). Teacher Education Research Center, Research Report No. 83-1, College of Education, University of Washington, 1983, p. 1.

of them have mastered the desired levels of the original behaviors. Thus, teaching behaviors that might predict effective teaching cannot be identified in the mastery model because it focuses on achieving outcomes rather than describing individual differences.

Finally, because the evaluation instrument currently used at the University of Washington is based on the mastery model, it is incapable of providing the degree of variance that is required for research on teacher effectiveness. Consequently, any research designed to assess student teacher effectiveness requires an evaluation instrument that can produce a sufficient degree of variance for the determination of more effective and less effective student teachers.

The Development of Computerized Data Management Systems

A second development also has produced marked changes in the state of the art in student teacher evaluation programs. Computer technology has made it possible for the collection, storage, and retrieval of data on student teaching in a relatively low-labor mode. Prior to the installation of a computerized data bank at the University of Washington, the retrieval of data involved a cumbersome, labor-intensive effort. Because of the resultant cost factor, the researching of data was discouraged on variables related to characteristics of student teachers.

The development of Data Base includes a storage system for demographic data on 42 student teacher variables. This development has accentuated the

need for new evaluation instruments that provide sufficient variance to enable comparisons of teaching performance data with the data variables stored in Data Base.

The Adoption of New Standards for Teacher Certification

This requirement, a third major development, is reflected at both the state and national levels in the standards for the accreditation of teacher certification programs. For example, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) document, published in 1979, included a standard (2.1.1) "Multicultural Education." The inclusion of this standard imposed an obligation for teacher preparation programs to include knowledge and skills in this area. The NCATE document specifies that:

> Provision should be made for instruction in multicultural education in teacher education programs. Multicultural education should receive attention in courses, seminars, directed readings, laboratory and clinical experiences, practicum, and other types of field experiences.[4]

The NCATE standard, as described in the foregoing statement, clearly requires student teaching evaluation instruments to include performance indicators for Multicultural Education. Also, at the national level,

---

[4]Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (Washington, D.C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1979), p. 4.

Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, included among its provisions the requirement that handicapped children must be educated in the "least restrictive environment" for their welfare. This means, of course, that for some handicapped children the regular classroom is the most appropriate environment for their education. Once again, the impact on student teaching evaluation is affected. Evaluation instruments must now include performance indicators that assess the ability of prospective classroom teachers to instruct handicapped children in the regular classroom.

In Washington State, the standards for teacher certification were modified in 1978 to reflect a national movement to provide more specificity in the requirements for curricula in the preparation of teachers. To this end, the 1978 Standards for Teacher Certification require that teachers, administrators, and educational staff associates must satisfy selected "generic standards" for certification. For example, the following Minimum Generic Standards were adopted:

> WAC 180-79-130. Minimum Generic Standards--General. A candidate for an initial certificate as a teacher . . . must demonstrate, while completing an approved preparation program, knowledge and skill in the following areas:
>
> (a) Socio-cultural-economic differences and human relations. . . .
>
> (b) Communication and Consultation. . . .
>
> (c) Exceptionality. . . .

(d) School law. . . .

(e) Professionalism. . . .

(f) Knowledge of K-12 educational setting. . . . [5]

A second set of minimum generic standards for teachers in the state of Washington was also adopted in 1978. These provided that the teacher certification candidate must demonstrate knowledge and skills in addition to those set forth in WAC 180-79-130. These included:

(1) Instructional skill. . . .

(2) Classroom management. . . .

(3) Subject matter. . . .

(4) Pupil/student personnel. . . .

(5) Pupil discipline. . . . [6]

Finally, the Washington State standards for teacher certification presented a total of eleven areas in which performance indicators would be needed for student teacher evaluation instruments to be in compliance with the 1978 standards.

Such developments as the foregoing gave sharp impetus for the revision of the existing student teacher evaluation instrument at the University of

---

[5]Chapter 180-79, Washington Administrative Code, Professional Preparation Certification Requirements (6/1/81), State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia, WA 98504.

[6]Ibid.

Washington. Consequently, members of the Teacher Education Research Center staff decided that revisionary efforts should be based on sound research principles and should produce student teacher evaluation instruments that are:

1. responsive to recent changes in teacher education (e.g., certification standards, computer technology, and an emphasis on research);
2. related to the outcomes of the teacher education program;
3. capable of providing measures that help provide answers about the quality of program graduates.

The purpose of the study emanated from the preceding three needs and is stated in the section that follows.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose was three-fold: (1) to conduct a literature search to ascertain the state of the art concerning the evaluation of student teachers; (2) to provide a conceptual framework for the development of a student teacher evaluation system; and (3) to select valid skills and indicators for use in the evaluation of student teachers.

PROCEDURE

The procedure for serving the purpose of the study was based on a search of literature. The search was conducted through seven phases, each of which was designed to provide a thorough, systematic research activity leading to the final product of the study. These seven phases are described in the following sections of the report.

Phase One: Initial Search Activity

The investigators decided at the onset of the study that a sharp focus would be required in order for the search to yield sources that were both relevant and substantive. The decision was made to begin with a search of recent professional literature published during 1975-82--a time frame that embraced the major developments in teacher certification which were discussed in the Introduction. The sources that were used for the selection of publications are identified in Table 1.

Table 1

SOURCES FOR THE INITIAL SEARCH OF PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE, 1975-82, ON STUDENT TEACHING EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS
1. Education Index
2. Research in Education
3. References cited in previously gathered professional literature

Following a perusal of the three sources, the investigators chose three descriptors for the identification of literature. This decision was based on the frequency of publications appearing in the categories related to the evaluation of teaching. These descriptors are identified in Table 2.

Table 2

DESCRIPTORS FOR SEARCH ON PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE PUBLISHED 1975-82, ON STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS
1. Teacher Evaluation
2. Student Teachers (Evaluation)
3. Assessment of Teachers

The search produced a total of 62 publications that were grouped

according to the three descriptors selected by the investigators. In order to provide a follow-up to the initial search, an ERIC search was conducted.

Phase Two: A Follow-Up ERIC Search

The investigators decided to sharpen the focus on student teacher evaluation instruments to include "research." This decision led to the use of the following descriptors in the ERIC search:

Teacher Evaluation X Research X 1975-82

The ERIC search produced an additional nineteen publications, including five unpublished sources. A total of eighty-one publications was produced as a result of the searches conducted in Phase One and Phase Two.

Phase Three: Personal Contacts with National Leaders in the Evaluation of Teaching

A third source of information on the development of student teacher evaluation instruments was researched by the investigators. This source included national leaders who had been involved in research on the evaluation of teaching. The location of these experts resulted from the investigators' personal knowledge of teacher evaluation research and program development at the national level. The following is a list of the national leaders who were contacted by telephone or written correspondence:

List of National Leaders

1. Dr. William Capie, University of Georgia, Athens.
2. Dr. Homer Coker, Georgia State University, Atlanta.
3. Dr. Kenneth Lowe, Florida State Department of Education, Tallahassee.
4. Dr. Barak Rosenshine, University of Illinois, Champaign.
5. Dr. Joseph Stulac, South Carolina Education Improvement Task Force, Columbia.

These personal contacts yielded a rich mine of information for the investigators. The persons contacted not only were generous with their time, but in four of the five contacts, the leaders sent to the investigators documents and professional papers relevant to the topic. One contact suggested that the investigators obtain a copy of the student teacher evaluation program at the University of Toledo in Ohio. This document was obtained and used as a reference by the investigators. The documents that resulted from the personal contacts with the national leaders are listed in Appendix B.[7]

[7]The investigators did not receive materials from Florida, as Dr. Lowe explained that his project was devoted presently to the development of an assessment system of the knowledge base of prospective teachers. The assessment of student teachers' performance was to begin at a later date.

Phase Four: Sorting Procedure for the Review of the Eighty-one Publications Produced by the Literature Search

The eighty-one publications produced by the literature search presented a vast array of presentations. On initial reading, the investigators found one type that represented "judgmental-expert opinion." These publications, representing a time-honored tradition of "wisdom writing," were, in some instances, not based on empirical evidence. Such publications served to acquaint the investigators with a perceptual frame of reference as presented by experts in the field. Another type of presentation tended to be descriptions or reports of teacher evaluation programs. Still another type provided information on the development of teacher evaluation instruments based on research activities.

As a result of the initial reading of the eighty-one publications, the authors were able to develop a sorting system for classification purposes. After several attempts to develop the sorting system, the investigators decided to code the various publications as described in Table 3.

Table 3

A CODING SYSTEM FOR CLASSIFICATION OF EIGHTY-ONE PUBLICATIONS ON STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION

Code Number	Code Categories
1	Rationales for Evaluation
2	Approaches to Evaluation
3	Selection of Evaluation Criteria
4	Design of Evaluation Instruments

The coding system provided the investigators with an efficient sorting procedure. Two copies of each of the publications produced by the literature search were prepared for review by the investigators. Each of the publications was read independently by the two investigators and sorted according to the four categories as designated by the coding system. On completion of the reading-sorting process, the investigators compared their selection of publications by categories. In cases of disagreement, the investigators conferred and as a result of deliberation were able to reach an agreement on the assignment of the article to an appropriate category.

Phase Five: Report of the Literature Search: A Conceptual Framework For Decision Making in the Development of a Student Teacher Evaluation System at the University of Washington.

Following the sorting of the publications according to the four categories identified in Table 3, the investigators selected twenty-five of the publications as representative of the literature on student teacher evaluation instruments. These publications served as sources for the substance of the conceptual framework which is presented in the following sections.[8]

Rationales for Teacher Evaluation

A number of rationales for teacher evaluation appeared, including subjective-humanistic and behavioral ideologies. In a sense, these represented a dichotomy: teaching as a holistic, qualitative phenomenon or teaching as a quantifiable phenomenon, subject to scientific rigor. Researchers who took an eclectic position advocated an approach that has ecological validity as well as sophisticated methodology. Thus, basic differences in rationale were discovered, necessitating a choice by the investigators.

---

[8]References cited in these sections are listed in Appendix C.

Approaches to Evaluation

Several approaches to evaluation appeared in the literature, which also varied according to the underlying rationales (Haefele, 1980; Kimball, 1980; Levin, 1979; Shapiro, 1977). The mainstream of the approaches fell into three basic types. The first focuses on the process of teaching and is based on the evaluation of selected teaching behaviors. These behaviors are usually stated in the form of predetermined competencies. The second focuses on the product--the learner outcomes that result from the teaching act. This approach is based frequently on behavioral objectives designed to produce changes in the learner. The third, a naturalistic approach, focuses on the art of teaching and the dynamics within the classroom. Other approaches appeared to be variations of these types.

The process approach, described by Darst (1978), Powell (1978), and Reiff (1980) is usually based on the use of a rating scale by a supervisor who evaluates the student teacher's successful demonstration of predetermined competencies. Bohning (1978) and Johnson and Yeakey (1979) were critical of the process approach, because it focuses more on teacher behavior than on learning outcomes. Yet it continues to be the most frequently employed (Shearron, 1978; Levin, 1979).

The product approach, championed by Popham (1971), leads to an evaluation by predetermined behavioral objectives based on learner outcomes. Some experts argue that product evaluation negates many of the problems inherent in the process approach. Ovard (1975) and Johnson and Yeakey

(1979) favored evaluation by objectives in order to relate teaching behavior directly to learner outcomes. Berliner (1976) stated that refinements in instrumentation, methodology, and statistics can promote empirical relationships between teaching behavior and learner outcomes. However, Eisner (1976) and Butler and Kantor (1979) were critical of product evaluation because of a tendency to reduce behavior to numerical scores that neglect what they considered more important aspects of teaching such as classroom climate, group dynamics, and other holistic factors related to ecological considerations.

The naturalistic approach was described by Eisner (1976). He stated that the conventional approaches which use objective, quantifiable criteria are too restrictive. He recommended the application of "educational connoisseurship and criticism" as related means of appreciating the art of teaching and critically highlighting the dynamics within the classroom. Others who supported this approach included Butler and Kantor (1979), while Popham (1971) was critical of it.

Among other systems of evaluation that did not fall neatly into any one of the three main categories were those designed to improve the affective aspect of evaluation. Clinical approaches were proposed by Reavis (1978), who attempted to reduce the threat of evaluation, and by Withall and Wood (1979), who used peer supervision for experienced teachers. Dodds (1979) also presented a peer assessment model for student teachers. He found good results with mastery of information and skills as a consequence of peer

assessment. Bohning (1978) advocated a student teacher self-evaluation approach based on the mutual goal-setting between the supervisor and the student teacher.

Shearron (1978) discussed the systemmatic observation instruments approach. It includes several well-known systems such as Flanders System of Interaction Analysis and the Galloway System. He found them useful for the coding and quantification of student and teacher behavior, as well as being the most suitable for research purposes.

Selection of Criteria

The major methods for selecting the criteria for teacher evaluation were a review of the literature, expert opinion,and ethnographic study. Often a combination of these methods was used. For example, Wotruba and Wright (1975) combined the literature review and expert opinion methods to collect criteria for evaluation. First, they created an item pool by searching through the literature. These items were ranked by students, faculty, and administrators. Second, redundant and less important items were eliminated, with the remaining items returned to the same evaluation groups for categorizing from most to least important. Third, this information was used to develop a Likert scale that was sent to different sample groups. Finally, the most important variables were grouped through statistical analysis to set the stage for the final development of an instrument. Dziuban and Sullivan (1978) and Pigge (1978) used similar procedures to validate competencies for teacher evaluation.

Criteria for the evaluation instrument developed at Whitman College, Walla Walla, Washington, were derived through a systematic process. This instrument includes detailed descriptions of nine general areas of teaching behavior that were selected on the basis of their consistent appearance in the literature, as well as for their agreement with the program outcomes designed for student teachers (Chiarelott, Davidman, & Muse, 1980).

Ethnographic studies develop criteria through observation of classroom activities. Berliner and Tikunoff (1976) trained observers to record protocols of classroom instruction, producing 61 dimensions or variables. This qualitative data base was extended to distinguish between more and less effective teaching. Ethnographic research also has yielded groups of strategies--chunking, differentiation, overlap, timing, and rapid judgment--which student teachers may employ to reduce the complexity of the classroom (Doyle, 1977).

Design of Evaluation Instruments

The problem of quantifying teacher behavior for the purpose of evaluation was dependent on several conditions which included the design of an appropriate instrument. The question of what constitutes an appropriate evaluation instrument should be addressed initially on a philosophical level (Butler & Kantor, 1979). Once the nature of evaluation has been determined--either as a somewhat open, relatively unstructured affair, or as a specific, structured process, or perhaps as a combination of both

beliefs--the particular approach can be developed and appropriate criteria determined. Only then can the design of an instrument be considered in agreement with the rationale, approach, and criteria.

Shearron (1978) stated that hundreds of instruments are available to evaluate teaching but few have been designed for use with preservice teachers. He classified instruments as those based on systematic observation, rating, interviews, and products such as lesson plans and anecdotal records. Of these, the rating scale has been used more extensively than any other type of instrument.

The teacher performance assessment instruments developed at the University of Georgia in cooperation with the state of Georgia Department of Education represented a comprehensive model for evaluation instruments (Johnson, Ellett, & Capie, 1980). The project has produced a set of instruments designed to assess the student teacher's performance of essential teaching skills across both humanistic and behavioral frameworks.

Summary of Literature Search

Categorization of the literature on teacher evaluation resulted in a conceptual framework for the development of an evaluation instrument. Important conclusions were derived from the literature: (1) Rationales for teacher evaluation include subjective-humanistic, behavioral, and eclectic ideologies; (2) The process, product, and naturalistic approaches to evaluation were the most visible in the literature sampled by the authors;

(3) Literature reviews, expert opinion, and ethnographic study were used to validate evaluation criteria; (4) The design of an evaluation instrument should be determined with assurance of agreement among the rationale, approach, and criteria.

STUDY OUTCOMES

Based on the findings of the literature search, the outcomes of the study resulted from the activities included in Phases Six and Seven. These two phases are described in this section.

Phase Six: The Determination of a System for the Evaluation of Student Teachers at the University of Washington

This activity was guided by four decisions of the Teacher Education Research Committee, following discussions based on the content of the "Conceptual Framework" prepared by the investigators. These decisions were that the system for the evaluation of student teachers would be based on:

1. a behavioral rationale, defining teaching as a quantifiable phenomenon and thus subject to scientific rigor in its assessment.

2. a process approach, designed to provide for the evaluation of selected teaching behaviors, contained in a rating scale to be used by a supervisor, who evaluates the student teacher's successful performance of predetermined competencies.

3. the selection of criteria that had been produced by validation studies as reported in the research literature.

4. the design of evaluation instrument(s) based on a rating scale format.

Phase Seven: The Selection of Criteria (Skills and Performance Indicators) for Student Teacher Evaluation

The decision to select only those criteria that had been generated from validation studies resulted in the selection of 199 criteria which are listed in Appendix E. The sources for these criteria are described in Appendix D.

(74)B

APPENDIX A

PERFORMANCE BASED EVALUATION INSTRUMENT,

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION,

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Performance Based Evaluation Instrument

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
College of Education

EVALUATION OF FIELD EXPERIENCE TEACHING PRACTICUM

Student _____
Last Name First Middle Maiden

Assignment _____ 1st 2nd 3rd 4th
Dates Hours per quarter

_____
Subjects(s)/Grade Level School/District

_____
Student Signature

PERTINENT INFORMATION ABOUT FIELD ASSIGNMENT:

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FIRST-YEAR ASSIGNMENT:

Academic Major(s) Level(s)
Academic Minor(s) Level(s)
Other areas of competence: _____

_____
Faculty Coordinator (Signature)

_____
Field Associate Teacher (Signature)

_____
University Field Coordinator (Signature)

_____
Norma M. Dimmitt, Director of Certification

28

1071

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA RATING SCALE:

Four areas of teaching performance are included: (1) Professional and Personal, (2) Instructional Preparation, (3) Instructional Implementation, (4) Instructional Evaluation. Behaviors considered essential to effective teaching are specified for categories within each area. Space is provided (*) for reporting behaviors unique to this student, setting, and subject. The performance profile to the right is based on the following five-point scale:

(1) Unsatisfactory: Does not meet expectations for a beginning teacher
(2) Weak: Barely meets expectations for a beginning teacher
(3) Good: Meets expectations for a beginning teacher
(4) Excellent: Exceeds expectations for a beginning teacher
(5) Outstanding: Far exceeds expectations for a beginning teacher

Performance criteria are assessed to the left, using these scale definitions:

1 2 3 4 5 — 6 Not observable in this situation

Unsatisfactory Satis. Noticeable strength

In addition, (⟶) indicates those criteria which need improvement.

OVERALL EVALUATION OF TEACHING COMPETENCE:

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	PERFORMANCE PROFILE Unsat. 1 2 3 4 5 Outst.
PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL	
Exhibits Professional Qualifications	
__demonstrates genuine enthusiasm for teaching	
__relates positively with faculty and staff	
__assumes teaching and extra-class tasks responsibly	
__strives to improve teaching competence	
*	
Demonstrates Academic Preparation	
__demonstrates specific knowledge of subject(s) being taught	
__understands structure and sequence of subject development	
__applies general knowledge related to subject(s) being taught	
__uses English correctly in classroom communication	
*	
Exhibits Personal Attributes	
__demonstrates positive interpersonal relationships with learners	
__displays initiative in assuming teaching tasks	
__utilizes well-modulated, clearly-articulated speaking voice	
__exhibits confidence when teaching	
*	
INSTRUCTIONAL PREPARATION	
Diagnoses Learner Characteristics	
__recognizes abilities, handicaps, and interests of learners	
__interprets formal and informal feedback from learner behavior	
__considers present performance level of learners	
__recognizes individual and group learning difficulties	
*	
Develops Instructional Objectives	
__develops valid unit and lesson objectives for learners & subject	
__prescribes specific, measurable learner outcomes in lesson objectives	
__modifies expected outcomes for individual & group differences	
__communicates objectives and their importance to learners	
*	
Organizes Instruction to Achieve Objectives	
__prescribes appropriate teaching strategies & learner activities	
__designates introductory, concluding, & evaluating procedures	
__utilizes a variety of human, material, & environmental resources	
__anticipates the need for alternative strategies & activities	
*	
INSTRUCTIONAL IMPLEMENTATION	
Manages Learning Environment	
__enforces effective regulations in managing learning activities	
__establishes workable approach(es) for controlling learner disruptions	
__maintains a physical atmosphere which is conducive to learning	
__organizes efficient use of instructional materials & equipment	
*	
Facilitates Instructional Objectives	
__establishes motivation specific for learners and subject	
__paces instruction flexibly, in terms of feedback from learner behavior	
__modifies strategies & activities to facilitate learner achievement	
__summarizes to reinforce learning and achieve closure	
*	
Promotes Instructional Interaction	
__involves learners in active classroom participation	
__stimulates learner questions, responses, and discussions	
__promotes positive peer group interaction	
__capitalizes on unexpected interaction & learning opportunities	
*	
INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION	
Evaluates Achievement of Objectives	
__assesses learner achievement of objectives	
__recognizes what facilitated or restricted learner achievement	
__evaluates learner achievement by formal & informal procedures	
__encourages learners to assess their own achievement	
*	
Uses Evaluation Results	
__guides subsequent instructions in terms of learner achievement	
__encourages learners to apply new knowledge and skills	
__evaluates teaching effectiveness in terms of learner achievement	
__modifies teaching behaviors which restrict learner achievement	
*	

25

University of Washington
Copyright 1973
Revised 1980

APPENDIX B

SOURCES OBTAINED AS A RESULT OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATIONS WITH NATIONAL LEADERS

Assessments of Performance in Teaching Observation Instrument. Prepared by Josef F. Stulac II, Director, et al. for the South Carolina Educator Improvement Task Force, Columbia, South Carolina, 1602 Bull Street at Taylor, March 1982, 29 pp.

William Capie et al. Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments: A Handbook for Interpretation. Georgia Department of Education, Teacher Assessment Project, College of Education, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1979, 161 pp.

Joan G. and Homer Coker. Classroom Observations Keyed for Effectiveness Research: Observer Training Manual. Georgia State University/Carroll County, Teacher Corps Project, Atlanta, Georgia, 1979, Revised 1982, 32 pp.

Joan G. and Homer Coker. Classroom Observations Keyed for Effective Research: User's Manual. Preliminary Edition 1982, Georgia State University/Carroll County, Teacher Corps Project, Atlanta, Georgia, 1982, 49 pp.

Charles E. Johnson, Director, et al. An Introduction to the Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments: Their Uses and Limitations. Teacher Assessment Project, College of Education, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1980, 19 pp.

Barak Victor Rosenshine. "Academic Engaged Time, Content Covered, and Direct Instruction." Boston University Journal of Education 160, No. 3 (August 1978): 38-66.

Robert Stevens and Barak Rosenshine. "Advances in Research on Teaching." Exceptional Education Quarterly 2, No. 1 (May 1981): 1-9.

APPENDIX C

LIST OF REFERENCES USED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHERS

REFERENCES

1. Berliner, D. C. "A Status Report on the Study of Teacher Effectiveness." Journal of Research in Science Teaching 13 (July 1976): 369-382.

2. Berliner, D. C., and Tikunoff, W. J. "The California Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study: Overview of the Ethnographic Study." Journal of Teacher Education 27 (Spring 1976): 24-30.

3. Bohning, G. "Subjective Judgment Pitfalls in Evaluating Student Teachers." Teacher Educator 14 (Summer 1978): 13-15.

4. Butler, R. J. and Kantor, K. J. "Evaluating Student-Teacher Interaction in English." English Education 11 (October 1979): 32-40.

5. Chiarelott, L.; Davidman, L.; and Muse, C. "Evaluating Pre-Service Teacher Candidates." Clearing House 53 (February 1980): 295-299.

6. Darst, P. "A Competency-Based Approach to Student Teaching." Journal of Physical Education and Recreation 49 (February 1979): 70+.

7. Dodds, P. "A Peer Assessment Model for Student Teacher Supervision." Research Quarterly 50 (March 1979): 18-29.

8. Doyle, W. "Learning the Classroom Environment: An Ecological Analysis." Journal of Teacher Education 28 (November-December 1977): 51-55.

9. Dziuban, C. D., and Sullivan, T. J. "Teaching Competencies: An Investigation of Emphasis." Phi Delta Kappan 59 (February 1978): 422-424.

10. Eisner, E. W. "Educational Connoisseurship and Criticism: Their Form and Functions in Educational Evaluation." Journal of Aesthetic Education 10 (July-October 1976): 135-150.

11. Haefele, D. J. "How to Evaluate Thee, Teacher--Let Me Count the Ways." Phi Delta Kappan 61 (January 1980): 349-352.

12. Johnson, C. E.; Ellett, C. D.; and Capie, W. An Introduction to the Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments. Athens, GA: University of Georgia, 1980.

13. Johnson, G. S., and Yeakey, C. C. "The Supervision of Teacher Evaluation: A Brief Overview." Journal of Teacher Education 30 (March-April 1979): 17-22.

14. Kimball, R. B. "Six Approaches to Evaluating Teaching: A Typology." NASSP Bulletin 64 (March 1980): 41-47.

15. Levin, B. "Teacher Evaluation--A Review of Research." Educational Leadership 37 (December 1979): 240-245.

16. Ovard, G. F. "Teacher Effectiveness and Accountability." NASSP Bulletin 59 (January 1975): 87-94.

17. Pigge, F. L. "Teacher Competencies: Need, Proficiency, and Where Proficiency was Developed." Journal of Teacher Education 29 (July-August 1978): 70-76.

18. Popham, W. J. "Performance Tests of Teaching Proficiency: Rationale, Development, and Validation." American Educational Research Journal 8 (January 1971): 105-117.

19. Powell, J. V. "A Process of Assessing Beginning Teacher Competence." College Student Journal 12 (Summer 1978): 231-233.

20. Reavis, C. A. "Clinical Supervision: A Review of the Research." Education Leadership 35 (April 1978): 580-584.

21. Reiff, J. C. "Evaluating Student Teacher Effectiveness." College Student Journal 14 (Winter 1980): 369-372.

22. Shapiro, P. P. "The Evaluation of Student Teachers." Teacher Education 11 (October 1977): 40-58.

23. Shearron, G. F. "Developing and Improving Instruments for Measuring Competence." Journal of Teacher Education 29 (March-April 1978): 18-20.

24. Withall, J., and Wood, F. H. "Taking the Threat Out of Classroom Observation and Feedback." Journal of Teacher Education 30 (January-February 1979): 55-58.

25. Wotruba, T. R., and Wright, P. L. "How to Develop a Teacher-Rating Instrument." Journal of Higher Education 46 (November-December 1975): 653-663.

APPENDIX D

SOURCES FOR 199 SKILLS AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Assessments of Performance in Teaching Observation Instrument. Prepared by Joseph F. Stulac II, Director, et al. for the South Carolina Teacher Educator Improvement Task Force, Columbia, South Carolina, 1602 Bull Street at Taylor, March 1982, 29 pp.

William Capie et al. Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments: A Handbook for Interpretation. Georgia Department of Education, Teacher Assessment Project, College of Education, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1979. Revised 1980, 161 pp.

George E. Dickson, and William Wiersma. Research and Evaluation in Teacher Education: A Concern for Competent, Effective Teachers. The Center for Educational Research and Services, College of Education, The University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio, May 1980, 98 pp.

C. D. Dziuban, and T. J. Sullivan. "Teaching Competencies: An Investigation of Emphasis." Phi Delta Kappan 59 (February 1978): 422-424.

Charles E. Johnson, Director et al. An Introduction to the Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments: Their Uses and Limitations. Teacher Assessment Project, College of Education, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1980, 19 pp.

F. L. Pigge. "Teacher Competencies: Need, Proficiency, and Where Proficiency was Developed." Journal of Teacher Education 29 (July-August 1978): 70-76.

APPENDIX E

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

TEACHER EDUCATION RESEARCH CENTER

May 20, 1982

Master List of Teacher Evaluation Indicators

From the Following Sources

1. University of Georgia (1-51)
2. South Carolina Department of Education (52-102)
3. Pigge, Bowling Green State University (103-127)
4. Dziuban and Sullivan, State of Florida (128-150)
5. University of Toledo (151-199)

1. Specifies or selects learner objectives for lessons.
2. Uses teaching methods appropriate for objectives, learners, and environment.
3. Communicates personal enthusiasm.
4. Works cooperatively with colleagues, administrators, and community members.
5. Specifies or selects teaching procedures for lessons.
6. Uses instructional equipment and other instructional aids.
7. Stimulates learner interest.
8. Follows the policies and procedures of the school district.
9. Specifies or selects content, materials, and media for lessons.
10. Uses instructional materials that provide learners with appropriate practice on objectives.
11. Conveys the impression of knowing what to do and how to do it.
12. Demonstrates ethical behavior.
13. Specifies or selects materials and procedures for assessing learner progress on the objectives.
14. Gives directions and explanations related to lesson content.
15. Demonstrates warmth and friendliness.
16. Performs extra-instructional duties.
17. Plans instruction at a variety of levels.
18. Clarifies directions and explanations when learners misunderstand lesson content.
19. Demonstrates sensitivity to needs and feelings of learners.
20. Participates in professional growth activities.
21. Organizes instruction to take into account differences among learners in their capabilities.

22. Uses responses and questions from learners in teaching.

23. Demonstrates patience, empathy, and understanding.

24. Shares and seeks professional materials and ideas.

25. Organizes instruction to take into account differences among learners in their learning styles.

26. Provides feedback to learners throughout the lesson.

27. Provides feedback to learners about their behavior.

28. Organizes instruction to take into account differences among learners in their rates of learning.

29. Uses acceptable written and oral expression with learners.

30. Promotes comfortable interpersonal relationships.

31. Uses teacher-made or teacher-selected evaluation materials or procedures to obtain information about learner progress.

32. Implements learning activities in a logical sequence.

33. Maintains appropriate classroom behavior.

34. Communicates with individual learners about their needs and progress.

35. Demonstrates ability to conduct lessons using a variety of teaching methods.

36. Manages disruptive behavior among learners.

37. Obtains and uses information about learners from cumulative records.

38. Demonstrates ability to work with individuals, small groups, and large groups.

39. Identifies learners who require the assistance of specialists.

40. Uses procedures that get learners initially involved in lessons.

41. Obtains and uses information from co-workers and parents to assist with specific learner problems.

42. Provides learners with opportunities for participating.

43. Obtains information on the effectiveness of instruction.

44. Maintains learner involvement in lessons.

45. Revises instruction as needed using evaluation results and observation data.

46. Reinforces and encourages the efforts of learners to maintain involvement.

47. Helps learners recognize the purpose and importance of topics or activities.

48. Demonstrates knowledge in the subject area.

49. Attends to routine tasks.

50. Uses instructional time effectively.

51. Provides a learning environment that is attractive and orderly.

52. Objectives for the lesson are stated in observable learner outcomes.

53. Lesson begins promptly.

54. Expectations for behavior conducive to learning are stated or have been established for students.

55. Instructional plan is communicated to students.

56. Courtesy and respect are modeled.

57. Learner objectives are compatible with content and level.

58. Instruction facilitates the students' achievement of a stated objective.

59. Firmness of the teacher in managing behavior conveys confidence.

60. A logical sequence is followed in the lesson.

61. Methods are used to positively reinforce students who are engaged in learning.

62. Stated instructional procedures are planned to achieve each objective.

63. At least two areas of student needs are accommodated in the learning activities.

64. Classroom procedures are directed in a confident manner.

65. Questions, descriptions, and explanations meet student levels of understanding.

66. Students are encouraged to express personal ideas, needs, or interests.

67. Learning experiences are planned to involve students actively in the lesson.

68. A stimulating technique is used to motivate student interest.

69. Learning experiences are provided throughout the observational period without loss of instructional time.

70. Explanations are restated in different words or initial explanations are sufficient.

71. Personalized references are used for illustration.

72. Materials supporting the achievement of objectives are stated.

73. More than one instructional approach is demonstrated.

74. Disruptions are addressed if they interfere with learning of other students.

75. Demonstrations or examples are used by the teacher for illustrations.

76. Support is demonstrated when a response is made to student errors.

77. Procedures or materials are planned to accommodate differences in at least two areas of student needs.

78. Varying organizational sizes are used for instruction.

79. School, district, or professional codes of behavior are adhered to and enforced by the teacher.

80. Knowledge of subject matter is communicated with confidence and authority.

81. Students are given reasons for actions, decisions, or directions.

82. Assessment procedures are planned to measure each stated objective.

83. All students are provided an opportunity for active involvement.

84. Techniques are used to involve students who are inattentive.

85. Content information communicated by the teacher is accurate.

86. The value of the lesson or of its components is communicated.

87. A record of individual student progress is maintained.

88. An opportunity is provided for all students to apply or practice knowledge or skills stated in the objectives.

89. Special assistance is provided to students.

90. Written material is legible.

91 Enthusiasm for learning and teaching is communicated.

92. Information is obtained from students to determine the need for clarification, assistance, or adjustment.

93. Adjustments in the lesson are made.

94. Written communication prepared by the teacher is free of errors in spelling, grammar, and mechanics of English.

95. Open-mindedness is communicated.

96. Information about progress or performance is provided to students during the lesson.

97. Patience and poise are maintained by the teacher.

98. Oral communication by the teacher is free of frequent errors in grammar.

99. A sense of humor is demonstrated.

100. Instruction is compatible with the physical environment.

101. Students are treated with fairness and impartiality.

102. Speech and voice quality do not interfere with communication.

103. Ability to maintain order in a classroom and to assist students in the development of self-discipline.

104. Ability to motivate student achievement via modeling, reinforcement, provision of success experiences, and appeal to student interests.

105. Ability to apply appropriate evaluative techniques for the systematic evaluation of pupil progress.

106. Ability to individualize instruction to meet the varying needs of students, via techniques such as mastery learning, alternate assignment, individual contract, and group work.

107. Ability to utilize audiovisual equipment and materials in teaching.

108. Ability to provide instruction leading to the different cognitive goals of acquisition, comprehension, and application of knowledge.

109. Ability to encourage and facilitate the development of social skills and enhanced self-concept.

110. Ability to prepare teacher-made tests.

111. Ability to utilize observational techniques effectively in classroom.

112. Ability to utilize an understanding of the formal chain of control, decision making, communication, and authority within each school unit and effects on daily operation of classroom.

113. Ability to interpret and report student performance on teacher-made tests.

114. Ability to understand role of teacher organizations with formal and informal competition for control of education and one's own personal role in joining or not joining such organizations.

115. Ability to continue the development and clarification of one's own philosophy of education.

116. Ability to construct behavior/performance objectives in subject matter field.

117. Ability to apply the major principles of school law to areas such as due process, contracts, certification, teacher liability, and corporal punishment.

118. Ability to use value clarification techniques at any age level.

119. Ability to distinguish between bonafide educational innovation and temporary, fleeting fads.

120. Ability to utilize the sources of pressure for change in education, understand currently suggested innovations and perceive potential consequences of alternatives.

121. Ability to apply the basic principles of how schools are financed, sources of income, and major areas of expenditure, and how these factors affect classroom operation.

122. Ability to understand the implications of the legal control of education by the state legislature, state department, and state board of education.

123. Ability to understand the effects of federal legislation and programs in education through financial support and Supreme Court decisions.

124. Ability to interpret and report student performance on standardized tests.

125. Ability to compare and contrast various philosophical viewpoints.

126. Knowledge of the interaction between the cultural matrices and educational systems.

127. Ability to choose from a broad knowledge of history of education the ideas that have shaped our culture.

128. Demonstrate the ability to orally communicate information on a given topic in a coherent and logical manner.

129. Demonstrate the ability to write in a logical, easily understood style with appropriate grammar and sentence structure.

130. Demonstrate the ability to comprehend and interpret a message after listening.

131. Demonstrate the ability to read, comprehend, and interpret professional material.

132. Demonstrate the ability to add, subtract, multiply, and divide.

133. Demonstrate an awareness of patterns of physical and social development in students.

134. Diagnose the entry knowledge and/or skill of students for a given set of instructional objectives using diagrams, tests, teacher observations, and student records.

135. Identify long-range goals for a given subject area.

136. Construct and sequence related short-range objectives for a given subject area.

137. Select, adapt, and/or develop instructional materials for a given set of instructional objectives and student learning needs.

138. Select/develop and sequence related learning activities appropriate for a given set of instructional objectives and student learning needs.

139. Establish rapport with students in the classroom by using verbal and/or visual motivational devices.

140. Present directions for carrying out an instructional activity.

141. Construct or assemble a classroom test to measure student performance according to criteria based on object.

142. Establish a set of classroom routines and procedures for utilization of materials and physical movement.

143. Formulate a standard for student behavior in the class.

144. Identify causes of classroom misbehavior and employ a technique for correcting it.

145. Identify and/or develop a system for keeping records of class and individual student progress.

146. Counsel with students both individually and collectively concerning their academic needs.

147. Identify and/or demonstrate behavior that reflects feeling for dignity and worth of other people, including those from other ethnic, cultural, linguistic, and economic groups.

148. Demonstrate instructional and social skills that assist students in developing a positive self-concept.

149. Demonstrate instructional and social skills that assist students in interacting constructively with their peers.

150. Demonstrate teaching skills that assist students in developing their own values, attitudes, and beliefs.

151. Plan units of instruction.

152. Plan instruction at a variety of cognitive levels.

153. State pupil outcomes and/or student course objectives in behavioral terms.

154. Has realistic expectations for the learning process and student readiness for learning.

155. Gather, organize, and evaluate pertinent information about students for effective instruction.

156. Identify and evaluate learning problems of students in content area being taught.

157. Keep informed of current professional/subject area literature and curricular learning materials.

158. Know how to select (or construct), organize, and use appropriate instructional materials and equipment to facilitate learning activities.

159. Use criteria and effective procedures for determining pupil achievment of learning objectives.

160. Select/develop appropriate assessment techniques and instruments for instructional activities.

161. Collects, quantifies, and interprets data from appropriate assessment instruments.

162. Maintain evaluation records.

163. Engage in professional development by obtaining and analyzing evaluative information concerning the effectiveness of instruction.

164. Use information about the effectiveness of instruction to revise it, with possible curriculum modifications.

165. Relate to accountability issues concerning responsibilities to students, parents, and instructional process.

166. Use a variety of instructional strategies.

167. Use convergent and divergent inquiry strategies.

168. Develop and demonstrates problem-solving skills.

169. Establish transitions and sequences in instruction that are varied.

170. Modify instructional activities to accommodate identified learner needs.

171. Demonstrate ability to work with individuals, small groups, and large groups.

172. Structure the use of time to facilitate student learning.

173. Use a variety of resources and materials.

174. Provide learning experiences that enable students to transfer principles and generalizations to situations outside of school.

175. Provide assignments/learning opportunities interesting and appropriate to different ability levels of pupils.

176. Demonstrate knowledge in the subject areas.

177. Demonstrate self-direction and convey the impression of knowing what to do and how to do it.

178. Work effectively as a member of an instructional team.

179. Use acceptable written and oral expression with learners.

180. Adjust components of the physical/learning environment over which the teacher has control to facilitate learning.

181. Provide group communication (cooperation, interaction, learning from others).

182. Use a variety of functional verbal and non-verbal communication skills with students.

183. Give clear directions and explanations.

184. Motivate students to ask questions.

185. Use questions that lead students to analyze, synthesize, and think critically.

186. Accept varied student viewpoints and/or ask student to extend or elaborate answers or ideas.

187. Demonstrate proper listening skills.

188. Provide feedback to learners on their cognitive performance.

189. Express a positive personal attitude toward the teaching profession.

190. Maintain an environment in which students are actively involved, working on-task.

191. Implements an effective classroom management system for positive student behavior (discipline).

192. Uses positive reinforcement patterns with students.

193. Assists students in discovering and correcting errors and inaccuracies.

194. Develops student feedback, evaluation skills, and student self-evaluation.

195. Accepts responsibility; is dependable.

196. Evidences cooperation with others (teachers, administrators, support staff, parents, etc.) in planning and teaching.

197. Acts as an appropriate model in terms of ethics, attitudes, and values.

198. Attends teacher and other professional meetings.

199. Understands and follows school law, policies, and procedures and their effects on teachers and teaching, including professional conduct standards.